

REVISED Minutes:
Process Standardization Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, May 16, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

APS – Conference Room 2 North

400 North 5th Street, Phoenix

	Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1	Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Tony Gillooly	Mr. Gillooly welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the May 2nd, 2001 meeting were approved with changes to items 2, 4 and 11. Item 11 (issue 71) was re-opened pending a position paper from Citizens.	
2	Report from Shirley Renfroe on revised Change Control Process	Shirley Renfroe	Shirley Renfroe (Pinnacle West) presented the revised change control process. Participants reviewed the document and suggested additions / changes. TEP would like to see an implementation timeline be added. The document will be placed on the ACC Approved Standards and Operating Procedures web page. Below are some of the major changes to the document. <u>Introduction section:</u> Changes from Staff to a PSWG approved document will be brought back to the PSWG meeting for discussion. Minor wording changes were suggested. Added text indicating the change control process takes effect once PSWG approves a document. <u>Section 1:</u> Text changes to the Low complexity sub-heading. Merge medium and high complexity into "HIGH" complexity after removing the third bullet under the current "medium" complexity. Remove the bullet "requires an additional standard" from existing "high complexity" <u>Section 2:</u> 2.1 Requestor: clarifications to the first bullet. 2.2 PSWG Chair: second bullet re-worded to clarify that if PSWG meetings are suspended; a special meeting will be called. 2.3 PSWG members: Added bullets --A) PSWG will prioritize issue B) Agree on a date to place issue on agenda. Remove the first bullet "provide input on change requests". Reword the third bullet and sub-bullet items. <u>Process Flow:</u> Change 2 hours to "agreed upon time frame", add box 1) below PSWG task team recommending there be no change, 2) that allows the requestor to withdraw change control process (close with no changes). 3) that allows the task team to present the changes to PSWG that then has final vote/recommendation. <u>The form:</u> Shade Priority box, remove "requested", move priority classifications. Add a field for # Attachments/supporting documentation. These changes will be distributed for review Prior to the June 6 th Meeting. Next meeting participants will review. Approval is possible if no changes are suggested.	
	TWO-HOUR DISCUSSION			

3	Issue 84 – Final bill Waivers	Judy Taylor	<p>Judy Taylor (TEP) discussed the draft waivers for the Final Bill and estimating usage for DA load-profiled customers. (new text was not available)</p> <p>Changes: Docket number needed to be corrected, remove proposed changes to rules—submit separately from the waivers.</p> <p>Revised waivers will be sent out prior to the June 6th Meeting</p> <p>Judy Taylor confirmed that two separate documents were appropriate and separated the suggested rule changes from the waiver.</p>
4	Staff will report on the legalities of sending the warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories (Issue 101)	ACC Staff	<p>Staff advised PSWG on the legalities of sending the warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories</p> <p>The UDC can give out violation information, unless there is a contract restricting the flow of that information. Violations are not considered confidential if the entity holds a CC&N.</p> <p>Janet Henry (AXON) requested that the task teams working on Performance monitoring discuss when/how to publish this violation information. Option A): publish with performance monitoring monthly report, or B) allow ESP's access to the information upon request.</p>
5	Report from Staff regarding adding the missing UDCs to the metering forms data elements table	ACC Staff	<p>Staff gave a status report on Ajo and Morenci that were missed in the listing of UDCs in the metering forms data elements table.</p> <p>Both Morenci and Ajo have been contacted. Morenci knew about this group and is on the mailing list. Ajo was added to the mailing list. Both entities are currently looking at the metering forms. Both entities intend to send representatives to future meetings. The entities wish to be added to the metering forms elements table as:</p> <p>Ajo's acronym: AIC AIO while Morenci's acronym is: MWE</p>

6	Metering Handbook TWO HOUR DISCUSSION	Stacy Aguayo	<p>Changes to the Metering handbook were reviewed and discussed. Minor changes were included in the presented redlined version (typo's, spelling, other little errors). Substantial changes were discussed and are noted on the "Participants Comments" chart. A new revision will be sent out prior to the June 6th meeting where the document will be further discussed.</p> <p><u>Overview</u> -- Minor Changes to wording</p> <p><u>Chapter one – Preface:</u> -- Instances of "standard offer" will be changed to "bundled Service"</p> <p><u>Chapter two – MSP Qualifications:</u> Tabled to the next meeting, Barbara Keene stated substantial changes may be made to this section despite being copied from approved documents.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM:</p> <p>All Participants: Look at the following chapters to clarify meaning: Chapter 2, Section 3.4 and 3.10 for the June 20th meeting.</p> <p><u>Chapter three – Equip requirements and meter products</u></p> <p>Section 3.9: define what load research meters are; re-word the remainder of the paragraph.</p> <p><u>Chapter four—Ownership</u> -- Sections 4.3 and 4.3.1 to read 25 kV and below rather than zero up to 25kV</p> <p><u>Chapter 5, 6, 7 – No changes</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 8- Process flows</u> - Minor changes</p> <p><u>Chapter 9- Providing Meter information</u> – minor changes</p> <p><u>Chapter 10- Purchasing/Transferring equipment--</u> Additions to "Purchasing of Existing Equipment" # 4 and #5.</p> <p>Reference documents:</p> <p>(1)TEP Comments, (2)Participants Comments on State of Arizona Direct Access Metering Handbook, (3) Citizens Comments, (4) Operating Procedures for Performing work on primary metered customers</p>
7	Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 101: MRSP Performance Monitoring and Testing	John Wallace	<p>John Wallace (GCSECA) presented a task team status report and addressed questions from the group.</p> <p>Confusion reigned around definitions of exception and violation. Once re-defined, monitoring of exceptions was discussed. The next meeting is scheduled for May 17th, 2000. The following meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 21 at Grand Canyon facilities.</p>
8	Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 61: MSP Performance Monitoring and Testing	John Wallace	<p>John Wallace (GCSECA) presented a task team status report and addressed questions from the group.</p> <p>Minutes from 5/15/01 meeting were sent out 5/16. Documents were reviewed (CCN, Metering forms, ANSI standards) and items were selected to monitor. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 19th at Grand Canyon State Coop.</p>

9	Approval of field requirement in the AZ 810 to Conditional from Mandatory and additional language requirements.	Tony Gillooly	<p>Discussed language that needs to be added to the field to make it conditional.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SRP presented if they plan to provide the reads in the future, or if have no plans to provide the reads ANSWER: SRP plans to provide the reads in the future. 2. Participants discussed field MEA06 in the demand measurement segment. Determine if the field is necessary. If it is a necessary field, what are the conditions for the field? The demand <u>with</u> multiplier applied is mandatory. While the demand <u>without</u> the multiplier applied is conditional. ANSWER: The field is necessary, as some utilities send it on their bills, however a business reason why the field is conditional is still uncertain. If no reason can be found to make the field conditional, it will be changed to "optional". <p>Action Item for All participants: What business reason(s) make the field "demand without multiplier" conditional?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. TEP shared their evaluation that they will always send the read and the impact of always sending the reads if the receiving partner does not need the reads (as in the case of commercial customers). ANSWER: Changed the gray box for the field to "send for all residential customers".
10	Locations for future meetings	Tony Gillooly	Schedule will be distributed at the next meeting
11	Review Open issues and re-prioritize	Tony Gillooly	The group will review Open issues and re-prioritize at the next meeting.
12	New Issues	Tony Gillooly	No new issues were added to the Master Issue list.
13	Meeting Evaluation	Tony Gillooly	The group provided feedback.
14	Set Next Agenda	Tony Gillooly	<p>The group set the next agenda.</p> <p>**The VEE document review has been moved to the June 20th meeting because LeeAnn Torkelson cannot attend the meeting to present the changes **</p>
15	Adjourn Meeting	Tony Gillooly	The meeting was adjourned.

PARTICIPANT LIST

MAY 16, 2001

PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

Name	Organization
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Brown, Debbie	SRP
Cassidy, Pat	SRP
Cobb, Anne	TRICO
Flood, Kathy	SRP
Gillooly, Tony	TEP
Greenrock, June	SRP
Henry, Janet	AXON
Keene, Barbara	Commission Staff
McArthur, Stephen	Mohave
Pichoff, Darrel	K.R. Saline
Renfroe, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Taylor, Judy	TEP
Torkelson, LeeAnn	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Wallace, John	GCSECA